IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE TWELFTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND SIX

PRESENT
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE BILAL NAZKI
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NOOTY RAMAMOHANA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.19684 of 2006

Between:

R.T.Narsinghbhan Singh.

..... PETITIONER

AND

The District Judge, Kurnool,
Kurnool District, and another.

.....RESPONDENTS

The Hon'ble Sri Justice Bilal Nazki
and
The Hon'ble Sri Justice Nooty Ramamohana Rao

Writ Petition No.19684 of 2006

Order: ***(Per Hon'ble Sri Justice Bilal Nazki)***

The writ petitioner seeks a direction from this Court to the respondents to give preference to him for appointment to the post of attender, as per the orders

passed by this Court in W.P.No.18906 of 1998, dated 18-08-1998 and also W.P.No.3363 of 2005, dated 28-02-2005.

Earlier, the petitioner has worked as attender for almost one year. When he was not continued, he filed W.P.No.18906 of 1998. This Court directed that when the regular selections are made, the petitioner's name must be included in the 'C' list and preference should be given to him as per the guidelines issued by the High Court, having due regard to the past service of almost one year which he has rendered. Thereafter, the writ petitioner filed another Writ Petition being W.P.No.3363 of 2005, in which, again he expressed an apprehension that preference will not be given to him in terms of the order passed by this Court in the earlier Writ Petition i.e., W.P.No.18906 of 1998. Then, this Court passed an order on 28-02-2005, which reads as under:

> 'There is no reason why the petitioner's representation will not be duly considered by the District Judge and in case if the petitioner is entitled to be appointed to the said post, his case will be considered as prayed for. It is not the petitioner's case that appointments have been made and that his representation was not considered so far. The writ petition is premature and it is accordingly

dismissed.'

Now, the present notification has been issued by the first respondent on 17-08-2006 and last date for receipt of the applications was 29-09-2006. The apprehension of the petitioner is that again he would not be selected. The interviews have not yet been conducted, as such, the petitioner, at this stage, has no cause of action.

The Writ Petition is not maintainable, and the same is, accordingly, dismissed. However, when the selections are made by the first respondent, he shall keep in mind the orders passed by this Court in the earlier Writ Petitions. No costs.

(Bilal Nazki, J)

12th October, 2006

(Nooty Ramamohana Rao, J)

LUR